

1953

Our Lady's Queenship in the Middle Ages and Modern Times

William F. Hill

Follow this and additional works at: https://ecommons.udayton.edu/marian_studies



Part of the [Religion Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Hill, William F. (1953) "Our Lady's Queenship in the Middle Ages and Modern Times," *Marian Studies*: Vol. 4, Article 11.
Available at: https://ecommons.udayton.edu/marian_studies/vol4/iss1/11

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Marian Library Publications at eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Marian Studies by an authorized editor of eCommons. For more information, please contact frice1@udayton.edu, mschlange1@udayton.edu.

OUR LADY'S QUEENSHIP IN THE MIDDLE AGES AND MODERN TIMES ¹

THE constantly growing interest in Mary's prerogative as Queen of Heaven and Earth has been given great impetus in our day both by the definition of the doctrine of the Assumption as well as by the fact that Marian congresses have been held all over the world devoted, as indeed this one is, to the consideration of the Queenly dignity of our Blessed Mother. It gives joy to the heart of every client of Mary to see this, not only for the external honor and glory paid to our heavenly Mother, but also because such glory inevitably redounds to the benefit of the whole human race, of which she, next to her divine Son, is at once our most glorious representative and our most powerful advocate.

But in the course of any theological discussion, it is imperative that what is said be based on the solid tradition that has been handed down through the ages in the Church. A historical approach to any doctrinal question such as this is fundamental. So it will be the purpose of this paper to consider the question of Mary's queenship in the theological tradition of the Church

¹ Cf. Luis, A., *La realeza de María*, Madrid, 1942; DeGruyter, L., *De Beata Maria Regina disquisitio positivo-speculativa*, Buscoduci, 1934; Musters, A., *La souveraineté de la Vierge*, Bruges, 1946; Garénaux, P., *La Royauté de Marie*, Paris, 1936; Morineau, B., *La Souveraineté de Notre Dame*, Paris, 1937; Santonicola, *La Regalità di Maria*, Pompei, 1938; Barré, H., *Marie, Reine du monde*, in the *Bulletin de la Société Française d'Etudes Mariales*, Paris, 1937-38; Id., *La royauté de Marie pendant les neuf premiers siècles*, in the *Rech. de sc. Rel.*, vol. 29, 1939, pp. 129-162, 305-334; Rolando, G. M., *Marie Reine de l'univers*, in *Marie*, (Revue mariale internationale, Centre Marial Canadien), Nicolet, Canada, vol. 3, no. 4, p. 47; Roschini, G. M., *La très sainte Vierge, Reine de la création et de l'histoire*, in *Marie*, vol. 3, no. 4, p. 17; Id., *Royauté de Marie*, in *Maria*, Paris, 1949, pp. 603-618; Dillenschneider, C., *Souveraineté de Marie*, in *Le Congrès Marial de Boulogne*, 1938, p. 127 ff.; Nicolas, J. M., *La Vierge-Reine*, in *Revue Thomiste*, vol. 45, 1939, pp. 1-29; 207-231; Lajeunie, *Maternité divine et regence de la Vierge*, in *Vie Spirituelle*, 1938, pp. 65-81.

from the middle ages to modern times, to show, with Father Malachy Donnelly's excellent paper on the patristic period through the 10th century, the continuity of the tradition on Mary's prerogative as Queen. This will be done by means of a rapid historical survey in chronological order of some of the chief writers on this subject, to show, first of all, that they did maintain Mary's queenly dignity as one of her glorious prerogatives, and secondly, to indicate something of the theological development in the course of their discussions.

For the sake of convenience the writers will be divided into three chronological periods: from the 10th to the 12th centuries, that is, from Peter Damian to Bernard; from the 13th to the 16th centuries, Albert the Great to Peter Canisius; and the 17th and 18th centuries, from Suárez to Alphonsus Liguori and Grignon de Montfort. Obviously, it is impossible to treat all the writers. Omission of any is certainly not a reflection on either his importance or his contributions; but an attempt will be made to touch on at least some whose contributions are representative, and thus present what might be classed as principal testimonies, while tracing the general trends of each period in the development of the idea. The humble beginnings of the patristic period gradually develop through these centuries into the elaborate Mariological treatises of the 17th and 18th centuries, while all along Mary's queenship remains a fact taken for granted by these theologians.

The 10th to the 12th Centuries

During this first period, there can be no doubt that Mary is called Queen by the leading theologians and writers. While the testimonies are by no means superabundant, still it is clear that these men wrote beautifully of that dignity to which Mary has been raised by Christ Himself. They picture her as seated on His right hand, gloriously reigning as Queen of angels and of men, Queen of heaven and earth. For the most part, the men

who wrote on this subject took the fact of Mary's queenship very much for granted. *St. Peter Damian* (d. 1072), for example, treats of Mary's queenship in his sermons and hymns, especially in his sermons on the Annunciation, the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin, the Nativity of Christ, and on the Assumption.² He speaks of the exalted dignity that is hers, raised as she is above all others in heaven—even the angels and saints are amazed at her glory and majesty.³ To her he applies the Canticle of Canticles: as Solomon prepared a throne for his queen, so Christ has prepared a throne in heaven for Mary, His Queen.⁴ She is truly Queen of Heaven.⁵ In his sermon on her Nativity, he says: "Today is born the Queen of the world, the window of Heaven, the gate of paradise, the tabernacle of God. . . ." ⁶ She is born of the royal line of Jesse, of the royal family of David.⁷ In his sermon on the Assumption, he calls her the "*domina mundi, coeli regina*" . . . on this day the angels assemble in great numbers, "that they might see the queen seated on the right hand of the Lord of Might, in golden vestments. . . ." ⁸ It is in glowing language indeed that he pictures Mary exalted to her queenly throne on high. Her power is the power of grace and mercy—she is the Queen into whose hands

² S. Peter Damian, *Sermones*, P.L., 144, 557 ff.

³ *Serm. XI in Annun.*, P.L., 144, 557.

⁴ *Serm. XLIV in Nativ. B.V.M.*, P.L. 144, 738.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 739.

⁶ *Serm. XLVI in Nativ. B.V.M.*, P.L. 144, 753 "Hodie nata est regina mundi, fenestra coeli, janua paradisi, tabernaculum Dei. . . ."

⁷ *Ibid.*, 754.

⁸ *Serm. XL in Assump. B.V.M.*, P.L. 144, 717: "Domina mundi, coeli regina . . . (hodie) virgo regalis ad thronum Dei evehitur. . . . Tota conglomeratur angelorum frequentia, ut videat reginam sedentem a dextris Domini virtutum in vestitu deaurato, in corpore semper immaculato, circumamicta varietate. . . ."

all mercy is given,⁹ who ascends today as the Queen "raised aloft to the height of her royal throne."¹⁰

St. Anselm of Canterbury (d. 1109) speaks frequently of Mary as Queen in the hymns, and especially in the prayers ascribed to him.¹¹ She is the "Queen of angels, the Queen of heaven,"¹² the "Queen of virgins, the Queen of grace."¹³ In his *Oratio 60 in Assumptione B.V.M.* he addresses Mary as gloriously reigning in the heavens as Queen of angels and of men, exalted above even the choirs of the angels.¹⁴ Her glory and magnificence are so great that he exclaims: "Nothing is equal to Mary; nothing, save God alone, is greater than Mary."¹⁵ She is the "most merciful Queen,"¹⁶ the "ineffable

⁹ *Ibid.*, 717: "Ascendit enim Salvator in coelum potestative virtutis imperio, sicut Dominus et Creator, angelorum comitatus obsequio, non auxilio fultus. Assumpta est Maria in coelum, sed gratiae sublevantis iudicio, comitantibus et auxiliantibus angelis, quam sublevat gratia, non natura. Ideo dies haec assumptio, ascensio illa vocatur, cum aliud sit potentia, aliud misericordia, solumque soli sit privilegium Creatori naturam rerum propria potestate supergredi." Cf. also *Serm. XLIV in Nativ. B.V.M., P.L.*, 144, 740.

¹⁰ *Serm. XL in Assumpt., P.L.*, 144, 722: "Haec est regina illa, quam videntes filiae Sion, beatissimam praedicaverunt, et reginae laudaverunt eam (Cant., VI). Ascendit autem hodie de deserto, id est, de mundo, ad regalis throni celsitudinem sublimata . . . ad regnum evolat sempiternum suum. . . . O quanta dignitas, quam specialis potentia, inniti super illum quem angelicae potestates reverentur aspicere!" He also calls her "queen" in his hymns. Cf. *P.L.*, 145, cols. 934, 935, 938, 939, 940, etc.

¹¹ *Orationes XLVI to LX, P.L.*, 158, 942-967; *Hymni et Psalterium de S. Maria, ibid.*, 1035-1049. Cf. also Jones, R. T., *Sancti Anselmi Mariologia*, Mundelein, (Ill.), 1937; Bruder, J. S., *The Mariology of St. Anselm of Canterbury*, Friburg, Switzerland, 1939; Ragey, S. M., *S. Anselmi Mariale*, in *Annales de Philos. chrétienne*, n.s., vol. 9, 1883, pp. 138-163; 255-284.

¹² *P.L.*, 158, 1039, 1049.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 1038-9.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 965, 966 *Oratio LX in Assumpt. B.V.M.* "Exaltata super choros angelorum gaudens et gloriosa in perpetuum regina coelorum, ubi adjuvas omnes qui te dominam glorificant, et sanctum nomen tuum humili prece frequentant. . . . In coelo, quo gloriosa exultas et regnas regina angelorum et hominum."

¹⁵ *Oratio LII, P.L.*, 158, 956: "Mira res, in quam sublimi contemplor Mariam locatam, nihil est aequale Mariae, nihil, nisi Deus, majus Maria."

¹⁶ *Oratio XLVI, ibid.*, 942.

Queen of mercy,"¹⁷ the "most clement Queen and sovereign lady (*domina*)."¹⁸ Anselm speaks of Mary's queenship so often as to make it clear that he takes it for granted; yet it is to be noted that he, as so many after him, qualifies her as "Queen of mercy."

With Anselm a word of caution is in order. He mentions the queenship of Mary frequently enough in his hymns and prayers—but it is somewhat amazing how infrequently he mentions Mary, and omits reference to her queenship, in his strictly theological works.¹⁹ Moreover, it must not be overlooked that a number of the prayers ascribed to him are of questionable authenticity.²⁰ This, of course, would not necessarily impair their value as medieval witnesses to Mary's queenship, but it does recommend caution when using Anselm as a witness.

One of the best witnesses to Mary's queenship in this age is undoubtedly *Aedmer* (Eadmerus) (d. 1124), the devoted disciple of Anselm, who faithfully followed the doctrine and even the style of his teacher.²¹ In fact, his work, *De Excellentia Virginis Mariae*,²² is still found among the works of Anselm, and for a long time was ascribed to Anselm. Mary, he writes, is the most excellent of creatures because she is the Mother of God.²³ She is the Queen of heaven and earth, and of every creature,²⁴ the Queen of angels seated on the highest throne in

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 943.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 943.

¹⁹ Cf. for example, his work on the Trinity, his *Cur Deus Homo*, his *Liber de Conceptu Virginali*, and his *Homilies*. *P.L.* 158.

²⁰ Cf. the discussion of authenticity in Jones, *op. cit.*, and Bruder, *op. cit.* (Note 11 above.) Fr. Jugie seems to question the authenticity of all the prayers: "Sont apocryphes, ou d'une authenticité fort douteuse, les prières pour les fêtes mariales qui lui sont attribuées, col. 942-968 (de *P.L.* 158)." Jugie, M., *La mort et l'Assomption de la sainte Vierge*, Città del Vaticano, 1944, p. 366, note 5.

²¹ Luis, *op. cit.*, p. 56.

²² *P.L.*, 159, 557 ff.

²³ *P.L.*, 159, 559.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 568.

heaven, which was prepared for her by her Son.²⁵ In chapter 8 of this work, on the Assumption of Mary, he does not directly call her *Regina*, or Queen, but by use of the idea of *domina*, the sovereign Lady who has dominion over all, he clearly pictures Mary gloriously reigning as Queen by the side of her Son.²⁶ In chapter 11, he writes his classic text about Mary's power: "Just as God, by His own power in preparing all things, is the Father and Lord of all, so the Blessed Mary, in repairing all things by her merits, is the Mother and the sovereign Lady (*Domina*) of all things."²⁷ God has dominion through creation and providence; Mary has it through her motherhood and her work in restoring all things to their pristine dignity.²⁸ Thus Aedmer bases Mary's power and dignity as Queen on her Maternity and the Co-redemption. Of all the Marian works of this age, this one of Aedmer had perhaps the greatest influence on later

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 571: "... quomodo non pararetur ad honorem et gloriam Matris suae, dominae scilicet et reginae angelorum?"

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 572: "Deus ipse huic piissimae Matri suae de hoc mundo migranti occurrit, eamque super omnes caelos exaltatam, cunctae secum creaturae perenni jure dominaturam in throno collocavit."

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 578: "Utique cuncta, quae Deus bona et utiliter fecit, in eo statu quo condita fuerunt, esse destiterunt, et per hanc beatissimam Virginem in statum pristinum revocata sunt et restituta. Sicut ergo Deus sua potentia parando cuncta, Pater est et Dominus omnium, ita beata Maria suis meritis cuncta reparando mater est et Domina rerum; Deus enim est Dominus omnium, singula in sua natura propria jussione constituendo; et Maria est domina rerum, singula congenitae dignitati per illam quam meruit gratiam restituendo. Et quemadmodum Deus ex sua substantia genuit eum, per quem cunctis originem dedit, ita Maria de sua carne peperit illum, qui in decorem primae creationis omnium cuncta restituit."

²⁸ *Ibid.*, 575: "Super haec cum ipsam dominam, per quam tanta bona eis provenire, prae oculis habuerint juxta Deum, quam de suo utero Virgo Filium pepererat residentem, et jure materno coelo terraeque cum eodem suo Filio praesidentem, consideremus qua exultatione exsultabunt pro tanta gloria ejus, quo honore sublevaruntur in tanta potentia ejus? Omnis utique creatura deferret eis honorem, non solum quia videbit naturae ipsorum consortem esse suum Creatorem, sed etiam quia dominatricem suam unam ex eis esse conspiciet factam reginam angelorum."

writers, for it seems to be the one most frequently quoted, though until recently it was referred to as Anselm's.²⁹

Among the other writers who give witness to Mary's queenship in this age might be mentioned *Anselm of Luca* (d. 1086). In the writings ascribed to him,³⁰ especially in his meditations on the *Hail Mary* and the *Hail, Holy Queen*, he addresses Mary as Queen on a number of occasions³¹ though mostly it is under the title of "*domina*." He gives a threefold basis for her queenship: "Thou art sovereign Lady (*domina*) by reason of your dignity, because you are the Mother of God; by reason of your virtue, since you are the first-born of virgins; by reason of your place, because your throne is above the throne of angels."³²

Rupert of Deutz (d. 1135)³³ in his Scripture commentaries applies the Canticle of Canticles to Mary, especially the sections that refer to the crowning and the glory of the queen. Mary is the Queen who is crowned by her Divine Son; she is the Queen of angels, the Queen of heaven and earth, "by right possessing the whole kingdom of your Son, and by this regard the kings and emperors will crown thee with their crowns."³⁴

Peter Abelard (d. 1172) in his sermon on the Annunciation, calls Mary the greatest of women, and applies the words of

²⁹ Cf. De Gruyter, *op. cit.*, p. 108; Musters, *op. cit.*, p. 69, 158-9.

³⁰ *P.L.*, 149, 577 ff. *Meditationes de Salutatione B.V.M.*, and 583 ff., *Meditationes super Salve Regina*. Cf. also Luis, *op. cit.*, 54, 55.

³¹ Cf. *P.L.*, 149, 580, 82, 88, etc.

³² *Ibid.*, 582: "Domina fuisti, ratione dignitatis, quia Mater Regis; ratione virtutis, primigenia virginum; ratione loci, quia thronus tuus est super thronos angelorum."

³³ *P.L.*, 168, especially *Comm. in Cantica Canticorum*, col. 839-962, which he interprets "de incarnatione Domini."

³⁴ *Ibid.*, 891: "Ita coronaberis, ut et in coelis Regina Sanctorum et in terris Regina sis regnorum. Ubi cumque enim praedicatum fuerit illud de dilecto dictum: minuisti eum paulo minus ab angelis, gloria et honore coronasti eum et constituisti eum super opera manuum tuarum (*Ps.* 8) praedicabitur et de te, quod sis, O dilecta et mater hujus coronati ac proinde regina coelorum, totum jure possides filii regnum atque hoc intuitu reges atque imperatores coronis suis te coronabunt."

Psalm 44:10, "the Queen takes her place at the right of the King" to Mary as Queen with Christ.³⁵ Also in his hymns he frequently refers to her as Queen.³⁶

Amadeus of Lauzanne (d. 1159) in his 8 Homilies on the Blessed Mother,³⁷ praises her dignity, her magnificence, her power. He, too, applies to her the words of Psalm 44:10³⁸—even the apostles and angels greet her as their Queen.³⁹ "Christ, the crown of thy head, has given to thee the principality of Heaven through grace, the kingdom of the world through mercy, the subjection of hell through thy conquering vengeance."⁴⁰ She is, therefore, the Queen of heaven, the mother of life, the font of mercy.⁴¹ And it is because of the bearing of her Son that she is given by the Father first place after Christ on the highest throne of glory in heaven.⁴² Her divine Maternity is the basis of all her glory and power.

Other writers of the age who mention Mary's queenship are *Peter the Venerable* (d. 1156),⁴³ *Arnold of Chartres* (d. 1156),⁴⁴ *Guerric of Igny* (d. 1157),⁴⁵ *Peter of Blois*

³⁵ *P.L.*, 178 *Sermo I de Annun.*, col. 384.

³⁶ *P.L.*, 178, 1793, 1815.

³⁷ *P.L.*, 188, 1303 ff.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, 1310.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, 1339.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 1332: "Habes ergo, O beata, gaudium tuum; impletum est desiderium tuum, et Christus corona capitis tui, attulit tibi caeli principatum per gratiam, regnum mundi per misericordiam, inferi subjugationem per vindictam."

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 1342: "Igitur coeli Reginam, Matrem vitae, fontem misericordiae. . ."

⁴² *Ibid.*, 1343: "At gloriosissima, carne integerrima . . . quo cunctis humilior et sanctior exstitit, eo super omnes elevata, et in coelum a coeli civibus honorificentissime, et ex more imperiali suscepta a Patre supremo, in regno claritatis aeternae, et in throno excellentissimo gloriae, prima post Filium, quem ex se genuit incarnatum, jussa est residere."

⁴³ *P.L.*, 189, 1018, *Prosa in honorem Matris Domini*.

⁴⁴ *P.L.*, 189, 1725 ff. *Libellus de laudibus B.V.M.* Cf. Luis, *op. cit.*, p. 44; Musters, *op. cit.*, pp. 62, 154, 189.

⁴⁵ *P.L.*, 189, 190 ff. *Sermones IV de Assumpt.* Cf. Luis, p. 58. He was an illustrious disciple of Bernard.

(d. 1200),⁴⁶ and *Anthony of Padua* (d. 1231),^{46a} all of whom give reference to Mary's queenship in their sermons.

St. Bernard of Clairvaux (d. 1153) the final witness of this age and the great *Doctor Marialis*, frequently calls Mary Queen in his sermons and hymns in her honor.⁴⁷ He praises Mary's exalted dignity⁴⁸—she is the highest of all, second only to God; he calls her Queen of heaven, made so by her divine Son, who chose to honor Mary above all others.⁴⁹ "Behold your Queen," he writes, "in the diadem with which her Son has crowned her."⁵⁰ "All generations shall call thee Blessed, O Mother of God, O Queen of the world, O Queen of heaven."⁵¹ And the source of all this power and dignity is Mary's motherhood, her co-redemptive activity, her place as mediatrix between God and Man. But while Bernard leaves no doubt that he holds Mary to be truly Queen—he takes the fact for granted—he does not develop the idea to any great length. In fact, in several places where one would expect to find references to Mary's queenship, Bernard is silent on the subject.⁵²

From this we might draw a word of caution as we sum up

⁴⁶ P.L. 207, 660 ff. *Sermo 33 de Assumpt. B.V.M.*

^{46a} Cf. Locatelli, A., *S. Antonii Patavini Sermones*, Patavii, 1895; Guidaldi, L., *Il pensiero mariano di S. Antonio di Padova*, Padova, 1938.

⁴⁷ P.L. vols. 182-185. Cf. also A. Raugel, *La doctrine mariale de Saint Bernard*, Paris, 1935; D. Nogues, *Mariologie de saint Bernard*, Paris, 1935; B. Hansler, *Die Marienlehre des Hl. Bernard*, Ratisbonne, 1917; Luis, *op. cit.*, 57; DeGruyter, *op. cit.*, 88-9; P. Aubron, *La mariologie de saint Bernard*, in *Recherches de Sciences Religieuses*, 1934, pp. 543-577.

⁴⁸ P.L. 183, 429 ff.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 415, 416.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 432-3: "Videte Reginam in diademate quo coronavit eam Filius suus. . . Est nimirum corona stellarum duodecim, id est, praeogativarum quibus reginae nostrae diadema praeferat universis." *Sermo in Oct. Assumpt.*

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 328 *Sermo in Pent., II*: "Eo beatam te dicent omnes generationes, Genetrix Dei, domina mundi, regina coeli. . ."

⁵² Cf. for example, his Homilies on the Annunciation and Purification, P.L., 183, 70 ff., 362 ff., 383 ff., his sermons *de Assumptione*, 2, 3, 4, *Ibid.*, 415 ff., his sermon *de Nativitate BVM. Ibid.*, 437 ff.

the witnesses and the trends of this age with regard to the queenship of Mary:

(a) While the witnesses found are impressive enough, they represent fundamentally only a small proportion of the writers of this age, many of whom do not refer to Mary's queenship at all.

(b) Those who do mention it, do so principally in their sermons, prayers and hymns.⁵³ In the formal theological works there seems to be little mention of Mary's queenship.

(c) The *fact* of the queenship in those who mention it is clearly taken for granted, yet there is little speculation on the subject or theological development of it. Some few do base it on the divine Maternity⁵⁴ or on Mary's co-redemption,⁵⁵ but for the most part this is only mentioned in passing and not amplified to any great extent.

(d) There is, further, little discussion of the nature or extent of Mary's power as Queen. Those who speak of this seem to indicate that it is mainly an intercessory power, that she is first and foremost Queen of mercy.⁵⁶

Hence, we might conclude: the fact that they greeted Mary as Queen and saw her queenship as one of her glorious prerogatives during these centuries is sufficiently clear; however, on questions of the extent of her queenship, the full meaning of the office for Mary, the fundamental basis of it—these questions are simply not the subject of any extended discussion.

The 13th to 16th Centuries

During this period there is still no formal treatise of Mariology as a separate tract in Theology; yet the Scholastics did

⁵³ Cf. for example, Anselm and Abeldard.

⁵⁴ Cf. Anselm of Luca, Aedmer, Bernard of Clairvaux, Amadeus of Lauzanne, above.

⁵⁵ Cf. Aedmer, Bernard, above.

⁵⁶ Cf. Peter Damian, Anselm of Canterbury, Amadeus of Lauzanne, above.

clear up numerous theological points concerning the Mother of God, especially in their tracts on the Incarnation. But it was still mainly in their ascetical works and sermons that they treated the Queenship of Mary—there was again little mention of it in the strictly theological treatises.⁵⁷ The 13th century itself produced several great Marian writers, and, strangely enough, seems to represent the highest development of this period on the question of Mary's Queenship. The chief writers are Bonaventure, Conrad of Saxonia, and Albert the Great.

St. Bonaventure (d. 1274)⁵⁸ gives his treatment in his sermons, especially those on the Assumption. There he elegantly describes the power and majesty given to Mary when she was brought into heaven,⁵⁹ where she reigns as the *Domina Angelorum*, and the Queen of all who rejoice in Heaven.⁶⁰ Placed far above the choirs of the angels,⁶¹ she is truly the "Queen of Heaven,"⁶² the "glorious Empress" of all creatures.⁶³ She is the Queen who is "seated at Thy right hand in golden vestments (Ps. 44:10), and is crowned with a crown like to that of the Eternal King."⁶⁴ This power and position are given to

⁵⁷ Luis, *op. cit.*, pp. 59, 60.

⁵⁸ *S. Bonaventurae Opera Omnia*, ed. ad Claras Aquas, 1882-1902; cf. also Chietti, E. M., *Mariologia S. Bonaventurae*, Sibenici, 1941; Di Fonzo, L., *De corporea Assumptione B.V.M. juxta S. Bonaventuram*, in *Marianum*, vol. 1, 1939, p. 327 ff.

⁵⁹ *Sermo 1 de Assumpt.*, *Op. Omn.*, 9, 689.

⁶⁰ Cf. *In III Sent.*, d. III, p. I, art. 1, q. II.

⁶¹ *Serm. 1 de Assumpt.*, *Op. Omn.*, 9, 689.

⁶² *Sermo 5 de Assump.*, *ibid.*, 700.

⁶³ *Sermo 2 de Assump.*, *ibid.*, 691. *Sermo 4 de Nativ. B.V.M.*, *ibid.*, 673; *Sermo 6 de Assump.*, *ibid.* 701.

⁶⁴ *Sermo 5 de Assump.*, *ibid.*, 699-700: "In coelum assumpta, sedet ad dexteram regis aeterni, coronata corona gloriosa per quam efficitur conformis majestati Patris aeterni secundum illud Isaiae sexagesimo secundo (v. 3): Eris corona . . . gloriae in manu Domini et diadema regni in manu Dei tui. Ipsa namque in gloria prae ceteris excelsior quasi in manu Dei ostenditur ad exemplum unionis et ascensionis desiderii. Unde ipsa tamquam regina coeli sedet ad dexteram Regis aeterni, secundum illud Psalmi 'Astitit regina a dextris tuis in vestitu deaurato' et coronata est corona consimili coronae Regis Aeterni."

her because she is the Mother of God.⁶⁵ However, Bonaventure is careful to limit this power. Hers is not the absolute dominion of majesty and omnipotence, for God can communicate this to no creature; but it is the dominion of one who presides and immediately assists the King.⁶⁶ God has given this position to Mary for three reasons: because of her nearness to Christ, because of her constant impetration for us, and because she is the new Eve, the new Mother of all the living, the new head of the race of men with Christ, the new Adam: "whence it is read in the first chapter of Esther: 'let another be given her kingdom, who is better than she.'"⁶⁷ Therefore, just as every knee bends in heaven, on earth, and in hell, before her Divine Son, "thus also for her every knee ought to bend. . . ."⁶⁸ Her principal work as Queen, however, is that she is Queen of Mercy,⁶⁹ the Mother of supreme mercy.⁷⁰ The Kingdom is divided into two parts—justice and mercy; "the Blessed Virgin has chosen for herself the better part, because she is become the Queen of mercy, while her Son remains the King of

⁶⁵ *Sermo 4 de Annun.*, *ibid.*, 673: Quia Mater Dei "non erit ancilla sed domina et regina, domina utique omnium, non solum terrestrium, sed et coelestium, ad quae se extendit ipsius imperium."

⁶⁶ *Sermo 3 de Assumpt.*, *ibid.*, 695.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, 695: "Sunt ad hoc tres rationes: prima est immediatio amoris cordis ad cor. Sicut enim nihil fuit medium inter cor Virginis et Deum, ita nihil medium inter thronum et thronum. Secunda ratio est frequenter interpellandi pro peccatoribus. Habentem enim interpellatricis et reconciliatricis officium non oportet longe sedere sed prope assistere. . . . Ideo dicitur Cantico sexto terribilis esse ut castrorum acies ordinata ad succurrendum mundo et demones expugnandum. Tertia ratio est, quia patriarchatus quam habuissent Adam in numero virorum et Eva in numero feminarum, ut sederent ad dexteram Dei, id est, in potioribus bonis, translatus est ad Christum et Mariam matrem Ejus, qui sicut illi fuerunt peremptores humani generis, ita isti fuerunt reparatores: Unde legitur Esther primo, 'Detur regnum illius alteri, quae melior illa sit.' Impetret ipsa nobis veniam peccatorum, quae cum Filio regnat in saecula saeculorum."

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, 698: "Sic et ei (Mariae) oportet curvari ab omnibus velint nolint." *Sermo 4 de Assumpt.*

⁶⁹ *Soliloquia*, Ch. 4, n. 26, *Op. Omn.*, 8, 65.

⁷⁰ *Comm. in Luc.*, Ch. 1, n. 81, *Op. Omn.*, 7, 80.

Justice; and mercy is better than justice, because it is mercy that glorifies justice."⁷¹ So while Bonaventure glorifies Mary as Queen, he also makes her Queen principally of mercy, into whose hands have been given all graces and powers of impenetration.⁷²

The second great Marian writer of this century, *Conrad of Saxonia* (d. 1279) was a disciple of Bonaventure, who imitated his master's style and thought so well that his excellent treatise, *Speculum Beatae Mariae Virginis*, was for a long time numbered among the works of Bonaventure.⁷³ Conrad greets Mary as "truly, the Queen of the world,"⁷⁴ the "Queen of Heaven" who sits at the right hand of the King;⁷⁵ "The Mother of God has entered thus into glory as the Queen of Heaven."⁷⁶ Indeed the very name Mary is interpreted to mean *domina* or the one having sovereign dominion, "and this is most fitting for her who is Queen of heaven, earth, and even of hell; of angels, of men and of demons."⁷⁷ Setting these limits to the power of Mary, Conrad then develops each in its turn, so that the 3rd chapter of this treatise becomes "a ring-

⁷¹ *Sermo 6 de Assumpt.*, *Op. Omn.*, 9, 703: "Beata Virgo cum Filio . . . divisit regnum coelorum cuius duae erant partes, justitia et misericordia. Beata Virgo optimam partem sibi elegit, quia facta est regina misericordiae et Filius ejus remansit rex justitiae; et melior misericordia quam justitia, quia superexaltat misericordia iudicium."

⁷² *Sermo 2 de Assump.*, *ibid.*, 692. Cf. also Chietini, *op. cit.*, p. 79; Di Fonzo, *art. cit.*, p. 344.

⁷³ Luis, *op. cit.*, p. 61; De Gruyter, *op. cit.*, p. 90; *S. Bonaventurae Opera Omnia*, Augustae Taurinorum, Marietti, 1874, vol. 14, pp. 233-292: *Speculum Beatae Mariae Virginis*. The references following are to this edition.

⁷⁴ *Speculum*, in *Op. Omn.*, 14, 270: "Vere, regina est Maria!"

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, 14, 271.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, 272: "Ingressa igitur est Mater Domini ad gloriam tamquam regina coelorum."

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, 240: "Post praedicta omnia considerandum est, quod Maria interpretatur *Domina*. Hoc quoque optime competit tantae imperatrici, quae revera Domina est caelestium, terrestrium et infernorum; domina inquam angelorum, domina hominum, domina daemonorum, domina utriusque in coelo, domina in mundo, domina in inferno."

ing apology for the Queenship of the Most Holy Virgin.”⁷⁸ Among the angels she is most powerful; among men, every soul is her handmaid—even the Church herself is such—“for through the hands of this sovereign Lady we have whatever good we possess.”⁷⁹ Among demons she is the rod of God’s anger and power over them, “so powerfully dominating them . . . that she protects us against those enemies.”⁸⁰ She is indeed the “*Regina potentissima*”⁸¹—“with God she is the most powerful above all creatures . . . in glory the most glorious after God.”⁸² “Because the Lord is most powerful . . . thou (O Mary) are most powerful with Him; thou art most powerful through Him.”⁸³ But while he effectively portrays Mary as the most powerful of all, second only to God, when he describes that power itself, he does so chiefly in terms of her virtue, her example, and especially in her office as Mediatrix, which for him seems to be the basis of her queenship.⁸⁴

But of all the Marian writers in this century, the greatest and most influential is without doubt *St. Albert the Great* (d. 1280). He has summed up his doctrine on Mary in his celebrated *Mariale*,⁸⁵ which is an encyclopedia of all the ques-

⁷⁸ “La ‘lección 3a’ del ‘*Speculum*’ encierra una vibrante apología de la Realeza de la V. Santísima.” Luis, *op. cit.*, p. 61.

⁷⁹ *Speculum*, *ibid.*, 14, 241: “Per manus enim hujus dominae habemus quidquid boni possidemus.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, 241.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, 272.

⁸² *Ibid.*, 250.

⁸³ *Ibid.*, 256: “Et quia Dominus potentissimus, potentissime tecum est: ideo et tu es potentissima secum, potentissima es per ipsum, potentissima apud ipsum. . . . Nam vere tam in coelis quam in terris potestatem habet Mater potentissima Creatoris.”

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, 241: “Oculi omnium nostrum ad manus Mariae semper debent respicere, ut per manus ejus aliquid boni accipiamus et per manus ejus quidquid boni agimus, Domino offeramus.”

⁸⁵ *Opera Omnia Beati Alberti Magni*, 21 vols., Lugduni, 1651, ed. Petrus Iammy. *Mariale, sive Quaestiones* (230) *super “Missus est,”* vol. 20, pp. 3-156. Cf. Bittremieux, J., *S. Albertus Magnus, praestantissimus Mariologus*, in *Eph. Theol. Lovan.*, vol. 10, 1933, p. 212 ff.; Cordovani, M., O.P., *La Mariologia di*

tions on Mariology of his day, to the answer of which he brings a great erudition.⁸⁶ The great value of Albert's work is not so much that he calls Mary "Queen"—he does that time and again, taking it very much for granted—but rather that he develops the idea considerably, especially in basing it on her divine Maternity and on her co-redemptive activity, and in suggesting that she is Queen somehow in the proper and formal sense of the term. His principle is that inasmuch as Mary stood alone with Christ in suffering, so she merited to stand with him as Queen-Consort of his Kingdom in triumph.⁸⁷ He repeats again and again this relation between her co-operation in suffering and her sharing in the triumph of glory and sovereignty in Heaven, this latter being the reward for her merits in the former. It is this idea that is constantly repeated in Albert's own words, and enlarged upon by later theologians.

Mary is, indeed, he insists, Queen in the full sense of the term. "By the same dominion and rule by which her Son receives the name King, she also is Queen; for she is truly become the sovereign Lady (*Domina*), being the Mother of the Creator of all."⁸⁸ He compares her power with the power of the ecclesiastical hierarchy, and shows hers to be greater; for these ministers of the Church apply the fruits of redemption, while Mary, with Jesus, helped to obtain these treasures of grace through her compassion. Hence her power, place and

S. Alberto Magno, in *Angelicum*, vol. 9, 1932, pp. 203-212; Scotti, P., *Le opere mariologiche di Sant'Alberto Magno*, in *La Scuola Cattolica*, vol. 60, 1932, pp. 97-112.

⁸⁶ Luis, *op. cit.*, p. 61.

⁸⁷ *Mariale*, q. 43, *Op. Omn.*, 20, 42: "Beatissima autem Virgo assumpta est in salutis auxilium, et in regni consortium: ipsa enim sola, ministris fugientibus, compassa fuit. Unde et sola regni consortium obtinuit, quae laboris adiutrix fuit. . . ." Cf. also Q. 42, p. 40.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, q. 168, p. 123: "Ab eodem dominio et regno a quo Filius nomen accepit Regis, et ipsa Regina: Domina enim, ut dicit Damascenus, vere facta est omnium Conditoris Mater existens." Cf. also q. 165, p. 120: "Ipsa enim ejusdem regni Regina est, cujus ipse est Rex." Also q. 29: "Ipsa . . . omnium quorum Deus Dominus est, Domina est."

dignity are greater than the greatest power of orders.⁸⁹ This is true even of the Pope, for he is the Servant of the servants of God, while she is the Queen of Angels and Empress of the whole world. "The Pope has fullness of power in this life, but not in heaven nor in purgatory nor in hell; the most Blessed Virgin has all power in heaven, in purgatory and in hell."⁹⁰ He even goes so far as to call her Queen in the proper and formal sense of the term—yet with so many others he immediately limits her queenship to mercy. "The one who would truly and by right have dominion over all that is in France would properly be called Queen of France; so the Blessed Virgin truly, properly, and by right has dominion over all that is within the mercy of God; therefore she is properly called Queen of Mercy."⁹¹ She is indeed a true Queen, but most properly of all she is the Queen of Mercy.⁹²

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, q. 42, p. 40; q. 43, p. 42.

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, q. 43, pp. 42-43: "Sunt in sacramento ordinis potestas spiritualis, dignitas ministerialis, et administratio executionis. Haec autem tria Beatissima Virgo habuit in se aequipollenter et excellenter. Ministri Ecclesiae habent dignitatem beneficalem per characterem excellentiae; Beatissima autem Virgo habuit coronam regni triumphantis et militantis Ecclesiae: unde summus ministrorum, Papa, appellatur et est servorum Dei servus; haec est Regina et Domina angelorum: ille servus servorum Dei, ista Imperatrix totius mundi. . . . Et sic quidquid est dignitatis et gratiae in ordinibus, constat Beatae Virgini minime defuisse. . . . Habet, enim, Dominus Papa potestatis plenitudinem in vita ista, sed non in coelo nec in purgatorio nec in inferno: totam autem habet Beatissima Virgo potestatem in coelo, et in purgatorio, et in inferno."

⁹¹ *Ibid.*, q. 162, p. 113: "Illa proprie diceretur regina Franciae, quae domina vere et iure esset omnium quae sunt in Francia: sed beatissima Virgo vere et iure et proprie est domina omnium quae sunt in misericordia Dei, ergo proprie est regina misericordiae."

⁹² Cf. Bittremieux, *art. cit.*, pp. 226-227. Cf. also *Mariale*, q. 162, p. 114: "Has rationes concedimus dicentes, quod propriissimum nomen quod beatissimae Virgini secundum suam dignitatem summam debetur est regina misericordiae et plus proprie quam imperatrix: hoc enim nomen magis est nomen timoris et rigoris, regina autem plus est nomen providentiae et aequitatis. . . . Item magis proprie dicitur regina misericordiae, quam domina dominarum, vel regina dominarum, vel dea dearum. Haec omnia important dignitatem et excellentiam respectu majoris et minoris; sed misericordia universalem potestatem respectu

Here might be mentioned another work on Mary which was formerly ascribed to Albert the Great, and found among his works,⁹³ the *Libri XII de Laudibus B.V.M.*—now thought to be the work of *Richard of St. Lawrence*.⁹⁴ This work develops several ideas on the queenship of Mary, mostly along the same lines as Albert. She obtains the title of Queen because of many things: she is herself of the Royal Family of David; she has been given the Queenship as a gift from her Son; she merits it, further, because of her dignity, because of her espousal to God, because of her coronation on the day of her assumption, because, finally, she is now seated on the right hand of the King, which is the place for the Queen alone.⁹⁵ As to the extent of her kingdom, it extends to heaven, earth, and even hell; but again, hers is a kingdom of mercy. "The Son of God has retained for Himself justice as the half of the kingdom; to His Mother, as the other half, He has given mercy; hence she is called the Queen of Mercy."⁹⁶ Like Queen Esther, her power is impetratory—but this does not deter her in the least from being truly Queen of all, exalted above all in heaven.⁹⁷

These contributions of the 13th century represent the greatest developments of this period. The following centuries, so far as the Queenship of Mary is concerned, seem to have been sparse in testimonies, and bare of any new speculation or development.⁹⁸ The greatness of what Bonaventure and Albert

majorum et minorum . . . unde misericordia illa omnia tria claudit in se; unde regina misericordiae est regina potentiae et sapientiae, et non a converso."

⁹³ Cf. *Opera Omnia S. Alberti* (cited above, note 85), vol. 20, *Lib. XII de Laudibus B.V.M.*

⁹⁴ Cf. Bittremieux, *art. cit.*, pp. 217-218.

⁹⁵ *Op. Omn. S. Alberti*, vol. 20, *De Laudibus*, lib. 6, cap. 13, p. 200.

⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 201: "Filius Dei sibi quasi retinuit justitiam velut dimidium patem regni, matri concessit misericordiam quasi dimidium aliam partem. Unde et dicitur regina misericordiae."

⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 202.

⁹⁸ Cf. Luis, *op. cit.*, p. 63, 64, 66, 67.

and Conrad had to offer on the Queenship will not be approached again until the 17th century, when once more the prerogative of Queenship will come under careful discussion.

This does not mean that there are no testimonies during this time. Some are available, but they are largely a repetition of what we have just seen. *Gregory Palamas* calls Mary the Queen of all that is in the world and above the world.⁹⁹ *John Gerson* (d. 1429) insists that because Mary is the Mother of God, through this she has natural authority and dominion over the whole world, and at her name every knee should bend; she is our sovereign Lady (*Domina*), our Empress, and he, too, uses Esther, the Queen, as the type of Mary.¹⁰⁰ In the four sermons on Mary ascribed to *Isidore of Thessalonika*¹⁰¹ there are quite a few incidental references to Mary's Queenship; while *Antoninus of Florence* (d. 1459) and *Lawrence Justinian* also give some incidental testimony.¹⁰²

St. Bernardine of Siena (d. 1444) in his sermons on the Blessed Mother, calls her Queen, and predicates of her supreme power over all creatures: "All creatures who serve the Trinity

⁹⁹ *Homilia 37 in Ss. Dormitionem purissimae Dominae Nostrae . . . P.G.*, 151, 459 ff. "Omnium vero creaturarum sive hujus mundi sive supra mundum positarum Regina fulget per suum partum ineffabilem" (col. 466). "Ipsaque a spiritu coelitus eximie confirmata, sublimibus sublimior felicitis generis felicissima constituit regina" (col. 467).

¹⁰⁰ *Opera Omnia*, Antwerp, 1706. *Sermo de Annuntiatione B.V.M.*, v. 3, col. 1366-67: "Hodie Domina nostra altius nomen accepit et perfectius quod esse possit homini post nomen Filii sui. Et est quod Mater Dei dicatur: melius eam appellare non possumus, quoniam per hoc habet veluti auctoritatem et naturale dominium ad totius mundi Dominum, et a fortiori, ad omne id quod huic subjectum est Domino; ita quod in nomine suo omnia flectantur in caelo, et in terra, et in inferno, et miracula ostenduntur: per hoc accepit plenitudinem gratiae non solum pro se, sed et pro omnibus. Propterea Dominus est cum ea, non sicut est cum omnibus, per omnia, per praesentiam, essentiam, et potentiam, sed per gratiam et sanctificationem singularem. Ideo Domina nostra dicitur Advocata nostra, Mediatrix nostra, nostra Imperatrix, per cujus manus Deus ordinavit dare ea quae dat humanae creaturae, secundum quod dicit S. Bernardus."

¹⁰¹ *P.G.*, 139, 118 ff. Cf. Luis, *op. cit.*, p. 64.

¹⁰² Luis, *op. cit.*, p. 64.

serve also the glorious Virgin," he wrote; in heaven, on earth, in hell, all are subject to the glorious Virgin.¹⁰³ Even the Son of God Himself served her as her Son on earth. Her power and dominion is based entirely on her Divine Maternity: "Her Divine Maternity obtained for her in this world this dignity by natural right, that she should properly be called Queen of Mercy, and this because of the greatness of her Son, who is the King of Kings and the Lord of Lords."¹⁰⁴

Denis the Carthusian (d. 1471) gives an elaborate and elegant testimony as he calls Mary "Queen, Empress, sovereign Lady" innumerable times in his writings.¹⁰⁵ His thought follows pretty closely the lines of Albert's writings—he bases her queenship on her divine Maternity¹⁰⁶ and on her compassion, because through her suffering with Christ she merited to reign with him as Queen of all in heaven and on earth; yet again he insists it is hers to be the Queen of Mercy.¹⁰⁷

¹⁰³ *Sermo 5 de B.V.M.*, cap. 6; *Opera Omnia*, Venetiis, 1745, vol. 4, p. 92: "Tot . . . creaturae serviunt gloriosae Virgini Mariae quot serviunt Trinitati. Omnes nempe creaturae quaecumque gradum teneant in creatis, sive spirituales, ut Angeli, sive rationales, ut homines, sive corporales, ut corpora caelestia, vel elementa, et omnia quae sunt in caelo et in terra, sive damnati, sive beati, quae omnia sunt divino imperio subjugata, gloriosae Virgini sunt subiecta. Ille enim qui Filius Dei est, et Virginis benedictae, volens (ut sic dicam) paterno principatui quoddammodo principatum aequiparare maternum, Ipse qui Deus erat, Matri famulabatur in terra. . . . Praeterea haec est vera: divino imperio omnia famulantur et Virgo; et iterum haec est vera: imperio Virginis omnia famulantur, et Deus."

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, cap. 8: "Maternitas Dei hanc in mundo naturali jure obtinuit dignitatem, ut Regina misericordiae . . . merito nuncupetur; et hoc propter Filii magnificentiam, qui est rex regum et dominus dominantium." Cf. also Folgorait, G., *La Vergine Bella in S. Bernardino da Siena*, Milano, 1939.

¹⁰⁵ *Opera Omnia*, Monstrolii, 1898; *De Dignitate et Laudibus B.V.M.*, in vol. 36; also the same in *Opera Minora*, Tornaci, 1908, vol. 4. Cf. Luis, *op. cit.*, pp. 65, 66.

¹⁰⁶ *De Dig. et Laud. Lib. 1, Op. Min.*, vol. 4, p. 51: "Consideratur in conceptione Filii Dei maxima dignitas ac potestas virginis concipientis, quae per hoc facta est dignitatis quodammodo infinitae, et Domina ac Regina totius mundi."

¹⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, lib. 4, p. 125: "Ad praesidentes et principes, ad reges et imperatores

St. Peter Canisius (d. 1597)¹⁰⁸ defended Mary's prerogatives in the face of Protestant attacks.¹⁰⁹ He insists that she is truly Queen¹¹⁰—her father, David, was King, and her Son, Jesus, is also King.¹¹¹ This queenship is not to be limited to "Queen of mercy," but rather, it seems, he would insist on more, on Mary being Queen in a more proper and formal sense, since she is the Mother of the King, and the Sister and Spouse of the King of Heaven.¹¹² He, too, calls her Queen on

misericordia spectat potissime. . . . Hinc quo maior, latior ac universalior est auctoritas et potestas, regnum ac dominatio Beatissimae Deiferae Matris, quae jure Maternitatis Dei, et quia comparentalis est Patri Aeterno, verissime creditur, est et vocatur angelorum et hominum imperatrix, Regina caeli, Domina mundi, tanto plenior et exuberantior est pietas ac misericordia ejus. Postremo, sexum femineum praecipue decet dulcor clementiae ac lenitas peitatis; et quanto persona sexus hujusmodi major est atque potentior, tanto eam esse magis piam condecet et clementem." Cf. also *ibid.*, p. 166: "Beatissimam dominam esse super omnium angelicorum ordinum altitudines elevatam, et collocatam juxta solium Filii sui, multipliciter comprobatur. Primo, quia rex et regina ab eodem principatu, regno ac dignitate denominantur; quia sicut rex Franciae et regina Franciae ab eodem regno nomina suae praesidentiae sortiuntur. Sed sicut Christus vocatur Rex caelorum, sic benedicta Virgo Maria Regina caelorum asseritur. Dignitas autem Christi et regnum principatusque ejus incomparabiliter est super dignitates omnium angelicorum spirituum; ergo et dignitas, regnum ac potestas sacratissimae Virginis."

¹⁰⁸ Both Luis and De Gruyter leave this wide gap between Denis and Peter Canisius.

¹⁰⁹ *De Maria Virgine incomparabili*, apud J. Bourassé, *Summa Aurea de Laudibus B.V.M.*, Paris, Migne, 1808, vols. 8, cols. 613-1449 and 9, cols. 9-409.

¹¹⁰ He calls her such constantly; cf. *op. cit.*, vol. 9, cols. 51, 53, 56, 57, 84, 88, 108, 150, 161, etc.

¹¹¹ *De Maria Virg. incomp.*, 1.5, cap. 13, in Bourassé, *op. cit.*, 9, 150: "Cur . . . illam Reginae nomine, Damascenum et Athanasium sequuti, non compellemus, cujus et Pater David Rex inclutus, et Filius Rex Regum Dominusque dominantium, sine fine imperans, laudem in Scripturis praestantissimam tenent? Regina est insuper, si cum illis conferatur, quibus veluti regibus caeleste regnum cum Christo Rege summo contigit, utpote illius cohaeredibus et in eodem throno . . . cum illo collocatis. . . . Regina est etiam nulli electorum secunda, sed simul Angelis et hominibus tanto praelata dignius, quo nihil illa sublimius ac sanctius esse potest, quae sola cum Deo Filium habet communem et quae supra se Deum et Christum tantum, infra se reliqua videt omnia."

¹¹² *Ibid.*, 149: "Primus autem, ut suspicor, Lutherus fuit, qui hanc nobis Catholicis calumniam strueret, quod quandoquidem Mariam coeli Reginam

innumerable occasions, and insists that this is the constant tradition of both the Latin and the Greek Church.

The comparative silence of these centuries can be explained in two ways. First, most of the theological works of these days were written in the form of commentaries on the *Summa* and on the *Sentences* of Aquinas and Peter Lombard. Inasmuch as in these works there was practically no mention of the queenship of Mary, the commentators had little to say on the subject.¹¹³ Second, with the dawn of the 16th century, the theological treatises took on a polemical nature against the Protestant reformers, and since the queenship of Mary was not one of the principal points of the controversy, it was discussed very little in the writings of the times.¹¹⁴ Perhaps a third reason might be added: it seems that the writings of these centuries are somewhat rare and difficult to locate, hence the absence of materials might also be due to the fact that many of the books have not yet been examined thoroughly and their testimonies on the queenship of Mary brought to light.

The accomplishments of this scholastic period on the question of Mary's sovereignty may be summarized in the following points:

(a) The *fact* of Mary's queenship is still taken for granted by the writers who mention it. They seem to consider it a prerogative of Mary which needs no special proof.

(b) The fundamental basis of it is discussed somewhat more fully. It flows from Mary's divine Maternity, the source

salutamus, Christo injuriam irrogari, quod enim soli Deo debetur, id tribui creaturae. . . . Quae autem Christi est injuria, si mater ejus a nobis Regina coeli vocetur? Estne in coelo serva aut ancilla? Si socia passionum fuit, cur non et consolationis? Si compassa est, cur non et conglorificetur, sicut Paulus ratiocinatur? Cur non conregnet si sustinuit? Si pauper fuit spiritu, cur non sit ei proprium regnum coelorum ut Christus ipse promisit? Non ergo solum coeli, sed et coelorum regina recte dicitur Maria, utpote mater Regis Angelorum, Regisque coelorum et soror et sponsa."

¹¹³ Cf. Luis, *op. cit.*, pp. 66, 67.

¹¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 67; De Gruyter, *op. cit.*, pp. 108-109.

of all her privileges, and from her office as Co-redemptrix, through which she merited to share in Christ's triumph as she had shared in His sorrow.

(c) There is at least the suggestion, though not as yet fully developed, that Mary is Queen in something of a more proper and formal sense, than simply in the sense of Queen of mercy having special intercessory powers before the throne of her Son.

So, in comparison with the previous period, it can be seen that while the fact of Mary's queenship remains clear, the idea itself and all that it involves is beginning to expand and develop.

17th and 18th Centuries

It is during this period that we find the flowering forth of the theology of the queenship of Mary. Up to now the fact has been taken for granted, and the same is true in this age. But previous to the 17th century, there had not been too much formal discussion of the problem. Now we find it beginning to be discussed fully, with a real theological precision brought into the treatment of it. Many fundamental points concerning the sovereignty of Mary, heretofore either simply mentioned, or passed over in silence, are now brought to the fore and treated with scholastic thoroughness; questions such as the specific meaning of the title Queen when applied to Mary, the basis of her queenship, the extent and nature of her power—these and other questions are discussed and answered by the theologians of this age. Whether we agree with their answers or not, we must agree that they did succeed in giving a really scientific approach not only to the question of the queenship, but to the whole tract of Mariology, for it is during this period that Mariology begins to come into its own and to appear as a separate tract in dogmatic theology.

One of the best-known and most influential of these theo-

logians is the great Spanish Jesuit, *Francis Suárez* (d. 1617).¹¹⁵ Although he does not give special formal treatment to the question of Mary's queenship, he does speak of it in his explanation of the Immaculate Conception, and one of his great contributions to the subject is that he brings to it his usual logical precision. In this he set a tone and pattern which deeply influenced those who followed him.¹¹⁶ He derives the Immaculate Conception of Mary from her twofold dignity as Mother of God and Co-redemptrix with Christ. To these he adds a third dignity: because she is the Mother of God, she is exalted above all creatures as Queen, the Queen of Angels and of men. Just as God is the Lord of all through Creation—and here he is repeating Aedmer—though he refers it to Anselm—so Mary, in repairing and renewing all by her merit in the redemption, is the Mother and Queen of all.¹¹⁷ Thus it is fitting that all honor and glory be given to Mary, because “as the Mother of God, she has a special right and dominion over all”; and with Pseudo-Athanasius he continues, “since He is King and Lord, the Mother who bore Him is truly judged as Queen and sovereign Lady.”¹¹⁸ She is Queen, too, because of

¹¹⁵ *Opera Omnia*, Paris, 1856, especially his *De mysteriis vitae Christi*, vols. 18-19. There the prerogatives of Mary occupy 23 of the 58 disputations. Cf. also Neyron, G., *La Théologie Mariale de Suárez*, in *Rev. pract. d'Apolog.*, vol. 57, 1933, pp. 665-685; Musters, *op. cit.*, pp. 68-72; Luis, *op. cit.*, 68, 69.

¹¹⁶ Luis, p. 69; Musters, p. 68, who reports that Bartholomew de los Rios called Suárez “the Theologian of our age.”

¹¹⁷ *De myst. vitae Christi*, q. 27, disp. 3, art. 2, sect. 5, *Op. Om.*, 19, 44-46: “Prima dignitas Virginis fuit esse Matrem Dei, quo titulo illi debetur maximus honor; et cum hac conjuncta est alia, scilicet cooperari redemptioni; cui fini nihil potest magis esse contrarium quam peccatum. Ex his sequitur tertia, scilicet ut singulari modo sit Domina omnium et Regina angelorum. Nam, ut recte dixit Anselmus (ref. is to Aedmer—Ed.): Sicut Deus omnia creando Pater est et Dominus omnium, ita B. Virgo suis meritis cuncta reparando, Mater est et Domina rerum. . . .”

¹¹⁸ *In III Partem Divi Thomae Commen. ac Disput.*, t. 2, disp. 22, sect. 2. “Nam beata Virgo eo quod mater Dei est, habet speciale quoddam jus et dominium in omnes creaturas; sed unicuique jure dominii debetur ab inferioribus adoratio. . . . Siquidem ipse qui ex Virgine natus est rex est et ipse Dominus

her place as Co-redemptrix with Christ—just as Christ is King because He redeemed us, so Mary is Queen because of the singular manner of her co-operation in that redemption.¹¹⁹ From these two factors he concludes that she is Queen by natural right and by heredity. However, in speaking of Mary's queenship, Suárez makes it clear that her power is not absolute, that she is not, as it were, the "Lady-King" having full sway over all. Her power is that of a Queen in the true sense of the term—that "which is accustomed to be found in the wife or in the mother because of union with the King"¹²⁰—a "truly genuine notion of the Queenship of Mary."¹²¹ Hers is the power of the Queen-mother, of the Spouse of the Holy Spirit; she has "her own power of impetrating, and all bow before her as to the Queen and the Superior."¹²²

Peter Anthony Spinelli (d. 1615) is another writer of this period who brought a scientific precision to the treatment of Mary's Queenship. In his work, *Maria Deipara Thronus Dei*, although his reference there to the Queenship is only brief and adds no new thought on the subject, nonetheless he counts it among the special privileges of Mary, and brings to bear on it proofs from Scripture and from the testimonies of the fathers and theologians. He finds its basis in the Maternity of Mary.

Deus; ejusque gratia, quae ipsum genuit, Regina, Domina, ac Deipara proprie ac vere praedicatur. Quia ipse rex est et Dominus, mater quae eum genuit, et Regina et Domina vere censetur."

¹¹⁹ *De myst. vitae Christi*, disp. 22, sec. 2, n. 2, *Op. omn.*, 19, 326: "Quamquam enim non soleat habere supremum dominium, suam tamen potestatem impetrandi habet, et omnes illi, tanquam Dominae ac superiori, deferunt. . . . Sicut enim Christus eo quod nos redemit, speciali titulo Dominus est ac Rex noster, ita et B. Virgo propter singularem modum quo ad nostram redemptionem concurrat. . . ."

¹²⁰ *Ibid.* "Et infra, quasi explicans vel limitans hoc dominium, dicit esse secundum sexum femineum, ac si diceret esse tale quale esse solet in uxore vel matre propter conjunctionem ad regem."

¹²¹ Luis, *op. cit.*, p. 68, n. 289: "He aquí la noción genuina de la realeza de María."

¹²² Cf. note 119.

It is because of her bringing forth of a Son who is the Lord of all that "she has a singular right to the goods of the Son, and therefore is the Queen and sovereign Lady (*Domina*) of all."¹²³

Ferdinand de Salazar (d. 1646), another Spanish Jesuit, although better known as a Scripture commentator,¹²⁴ also added a good deal to Mariology, both through his defense of the Immaculate Conception, as well as in his treatment of Mary's queenship which is found in his commentary on the Book of Proverbs, chapter 8, where he asks the question in applying the concept of Wisdom there to Mary, "*quo ex capite aut titulo Virgo Maria tantum imperium adepta fuerit.*"¹²⁵ For him, the fact of the sovereignty of Mary is without doubt. It is clear in the unanimous testimony of the Fathers, in the prayers and practices of the Church and in the consent and belief of the Faithful.¹²⁶ He makes notable progress, however, on several other fundamental questions. He insists that Mary is Queen not only in the metaphorical sense, that is, through her excellence and outstanding qualities as the greatest of creatures, but also and chiefly in the proper and formal sense, that is, she is Queen in the sense of having a real power, a right to rule her subjects: not in the absolute sense, but the power "which, as Consort of the Kingdom, wives are accustomed to have with their husbands."¹²⁷ Thus he sees Mary

¹²³ *Maria Deipara Thronus Dei*, Neapoli, 1613, cap. 5, p. 47, n. 7: "Ratione Maternitatis ad bona filii qui est omnium Dominus, habet singulare jus ideoque est Regina ac Domina omnium." Cf. Musters, *op. cit.*, p. 72.

¹²⁴ Musters, *op. cit.*, p. 73.

¹²⁵ *Pro Immaculata Conceptione Deiparae Virginis defensio*, Compluti, 1618; *Expositio in Proverbia Salomonis*, Lugduni, 1637, c. 8. "Sed tamen illud vestigare et indagare oportet, quo ex capite, aut titulo Virgo Maria tantum imperium adepta fuerit" (p. 234, n. 115). It is especially on verses 15 and 16 of chapter 8 of Proverbs, "per me reges regnant; et legum conditores iusta decernunt. Per me principes imperant et potentes decernunt iustitiam" that he explains his doctrine on the queenship.

¹²⁶ *Expos. in Prov.*, c. 8, p. 233, nn. 111, 112.

¹²⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 233: "Ut haec penitus inspiciamus, observandum est Virginem Dominam, aut Reginam rerum omnium, non uno modo appellari posse. Nam

as Queen in the ordinary proper sense of the term, as companion to the King, ruling with Him, but still subordinate to Him.

The basis of this queenship is the Divine Maternity.¹²⁸ But here he adds another point of discussion. How is it, he asks, that the dignity of the Son redounds to the honor of the Mother, where ordinarily it is the opposite that is true? The rule and dignity of King may be acquired, he answers, by natural right, by conquest, or by election. Salazar readily admits that in an election the right to rule is given to the person elected; however, where natural right is involved, or a right of conquest—and he takes it for granted that this right of conquest includes some natural right to conquer—then the parents participate in the right that belongs to the child. And this is the case with Mary. Her Son, Jesus, is the supreme Sovereign and absolute King of all by reason of the Hypostatic Union, which confers on Him the royal unction and power by natural right; moreover, He is King also by right of conquest, since He has ransomed all men through His work of Redemption. Mary, then, is Queen because she is His true Mother, and also because she is Co-redemptrix with Him, thus sharing with Him both the natural right as well as the right-by-conquest to the Kingdom. She is, then, “truly and properly the Queen and the Supreme Empress.”¹²⁹ So, by applying Aristotle's

Reginae nomen nonnumquam assumitur ad significandam praestantiam, non jus aut potestatem. Ea acceptione 'Regina pulchritudinis' Venus appellata est, quia scilicet reliquas Deas pulchritudine superabat. . . . Rursus Reginae nomen accipitur, germane, et proprie ad significandum jus regni, et Regiam potestatem in subditos, quam ex regni consortio uxores communem habent cum maritis.”

¹²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 235, n. 123: “Constat unicam mariani imperii regnique radicem esse maternitatem, ob quam non metaphorice ac improprie, sed germane et proprie omnium creaturarum regina est.”

¹²⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 235, n. 127-28: “Triplici modo imperium alicui evenire potest. Primus est a natura ipsa. Secundus modus est, cum aliquis armis, arte aut alia ratione regnum aliquod debellavit, et sibi subiecit. Tertius modus est, cum aliquis electione, aut dedicatione multitudinis Rex creator. Ergo assero primo, si imperium, regnumque vel in universum honor quilibet filio a natura contingat,

logic¹⁸⁰ and the scholastic method, Salazar helps give greater theological precision to Mary's Queenship.

Francis Poiré (d. 1637) wrote his chief theological treatise on the Blessed Mother: the *Triple Crown of the Most Blessed Virgin Mother of God*.¹⁸¹ In it he develops the glories of Mary, the Heavenly Queen, in her threefold crown of excellence, of power and of benevolence (*bonité*). It is in the second tract, the crown of Power, that he develops his ideas on the sovereignty of Mary. She has it by natural right, and she is Queen in the proper and formal sense of the term.¹⁸² He repeats these ideas with force and clarity, though adding little to what is found in Suárez and Salazar.

Another great Mariologist of this age is *Christopher de*

non potest non in parentes remigrare: cum enim filius naturaliter patri subiaceat, paterque natura ipsa superior sit, quaecumque filius naturaliter obtinet, parenti necessario cedunt, atque in illum redundant. Item cum filius sit praecipua quaedam parentis sui portio, vel idem omnino cum illo non potest esse bonorum discrimen et separatio. Secundo etiam exploratum mihi est, quod si aliquis filius per semetipsum imperium assecutus sit, parentibus etiam accrescit imperium (loquor autem de jure naturali, omissis mancipationibus, quas quidem jus civile adinvenit, ac moderatur). Ratio est in promptu, quia ex naturae legibus non solum opes, quas filius nanciscitur, sed etiam omnia alia jura et potestates parentibus accrescunt. . . . His constitutis, decerno Virginem Deiparam vere et proprie et non per similitudinem reginam et supremam Imperatricem esse ex eo, quia mater est summi Regis et Imperatoris rerum omnium; non electione aliqua, aut privilegio, sed jure ipso naturali. Ratio vere ducitur ex dictis supra, quia Christus non ex electione, aut ex meritis (quamvis id quoque mereri potuisset exploratum est), sed natura ipsa vere et proprie, et non per similitudinem Rex et Imperator summus est, nimirum ex divinitate, quae illum sicut sacerdotem, ita etiam regem inunxit. Atqui omnis honor et dignitas quae natura ipsa competit filio, ad matrem necessario redit: ergo sanctissima Deipara vere et proprie Regina est, juxta Aristotelis principia supra adscripta."

¹⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 325, nn. 126-7.

¹⁸¹ *La Triple Couronne de la bienheureuse Vierge Mère de Dieu*, Paris, 1620; also published in Latin translation, *Corona Augustissimae Virginis Dei Matris*, Lugduni, 1645.

¹⁸² "La royauté, étant la faite du pouvoir et le plus haut point de la Grandeur, elle mérite bien de tenir place parmi les principales Grandeurs du pouvoir de la Mère de Dieu." *La Triple Couronne*, ed. Tournay, 1849, vol. 3, p. 425.

Vega (d. 1672). Father Luis says that he is the "first theologian who studied directly and formally, in a scientific manner, the sovereignty of Mary."¹⁸³ In the second volume of his *Theologia Mariana*¹⁸⁴ he sets out to prove "that Mary is truly and properly Queen and sovereign Lady (*Domina*) of the universe."¹⁸⁵ In explaining the meaning of Queen, he produces arguments, many the same as Salazar, to show that Mary is Queen not in the transferred and improper sense, but "truly and properly, inasmuch as it means the right of rule, dominion and power over things and subjects."¹⁸⁶ The basis for this sovereignty he finds in the divine Maternity, in Mary's office as Co-redemptrix, in the fact that she was the Spouse of God the Holy Ghost, and finally in the gift of original justice given to her by God, through which she stands alone as the greatest of mankind.¹⁸⁷ He, too, considers the difficulty Salazar saw—how the kingly dignity came by right of inheritance from Son to Mother. His answer is the same: when the kingship comes by natural right, as it does to Christ, then the parent shares that same natural right in the begetting of the child: "thus certainly if the son gains the kingship by nature, surely the father is the king of a king, therefore fully a king; for whatever things fall to the son by nature itself,

¹⁸³ Luis, *op. cit.*, p. 70. "El es el primer teólogo que estudia directa y formalmente, a estilo científico, la realeza de María. . . ."

¹⁸⁴ Neapoli, 1866.

¹⁸⁵ *Op. cit.*, Palestra 27, cert. 1, vol. 2, p. 349: "Hinc pronum erit praeceptum nostrum intentum aggredi, videlicet B. Virginem Dei Genitricem vere et proprie Reginam esse ac Dominam universi. . . ."

¹⁸⁶ *Ibid.*: "Hic nos reginae nomen non translatit et improprie, sed vere et proprie, quatenus adsignificat jus regni, dominum ac potestatem in res ac subditos, desumimus."

¹⁸⁷ *Ibid.*: "In proprietate ergo hujus significationis dicimus multiplici ex capite, regnum hoc ac dominum in omnes res creatas nactam fuisse Virginem Deiparam: videlicet, primo ex Maternitate Dei; secundo ex officio corredemptricis, quia simul cum Filio omnes homines in libertatem assueruit, opusque Redemptionis peregit; tertio quia Spiritus Sanctus B. Virginem in sponsam sibi copulavit; quarto ex dono justitiae originalis."

necessarily they fall back on the parent."¹³⁸ And he concludes: "But Christ the Lord, not by any privilege, nor by the election of men, but by natural heredity or right, has received for Himself the kingdom and empire of all creatures . . . therefore the same dignity and dominion is reflected on the Mother of God."¹³⁹ To his treatment of all these points on the queenship, he brings a "tremendous patristic erudition and a rigorous scholastic reasoning."¹⁴⁰

The principal work of the Polish Dominican, *Justin of Miechow* (d. 1689) is his book of *Discourses on the Litany of the Blessed Mother*.¹⁴¹ This tribute to the Mother of God is something of a polemic against the Protestant attacks on Mary.¹⁴² It is filled with extensive material on the queenship of Mary, especially in his comments on the invocations addressing her as "Queen." He introduces these invocations with a preliminary conference proving that Mary truly is Queen, and then gives an excellent treatment of the queenship in the comments on these invocations.¹⁴³

Among other things, Justin insists that Mariology belongs properly in theology and theological treatises, and not in sermons and ascetical works only. "There is one science about God, about Christ, and about Mary—one and the same sci-

¹³⁸ *Ibid.*: "Quaelibet enim dignitas et honos, quo a natura sua gaudet filius, in parentes etiam refunditur . . . unde si filius a natura sortiatur regnum, sane pater rex erit regis, adeoque absolute rex; quaecumque enim filius a natura ipsa sortitur, in parentem necessario redundant."

¹³⁹ *Op. cit.*, p. 350: "At Christus Dominus non ex hominum electione vel privilegio, sed jure ipso naturali sibi regnum et imperium creaturarum omnium comparavit . . . ergo etiam eadem dignitas et imperium in Dei genitricem refundetur."

¹⁴⁰ Luis, *op. cit.*, p. 71.

¹⁴¹ *Discursus praedicabiles super Litanias Lauretanas*, Lugduni, 1660. Cf. also Musters, *op. cit.*, pp. 87-91. The *Discursus* was reprinted in Naples, 1857; there is a French edition by A. Richard, Paris, 1868.

¹⁴² Luis, *op. cit.*, p. 70.

¹⁴³ *Ibid.*, p. 71.

ence."¹⁴⁴ In his own work, he happily combines "pastoral warmth or unction with a remarkable theological solidity."¹⁴⁵

In his comments on *Virgo Veneranda* he states that the basis of Mary's dominion is in the divine Maternity and Mary's co-redemptive activity with Christ.¹⁴⁶ Then particularly in his comments on *Regina Angelorum* he gives his most explicit treatment "that the Blessed Virgin Mary is Queen."¹⁴⁷ Worthy of note is the way he develops Mary's right to be Queen. She is Queen, he insists, by natural right because she is of the family of David; by divine right because she is the Mother of Christ; she is Queen also, he continues, by human right, and this through four titles: the title of heredity, because Christ in His human nature was given absolute and direct dominion over all, and Mary shares this heredity as His Mother; by title of conquest, because through her co-redemptive activity with Christ she conquered the world; by right of purchase—Christ purchased His Kingship by redeeming man, and Mary is Queen by the same title; and finally by title of gift, or donation, for Christ has freely and generously given

¹⁴⁴ *Discursus* etc., vol. 1, disc. 3, p. 6, nn. 5, 6: "De Deipara sermo atque scientia non est, ut quidam volunt, solis probabilitatibus innixa; sed est Theologiae pars eminentissima, subtilissima, et quocumque Theologo acuto dignissima. De Deo, Christo, et Maria una eademque est scientia. Nam sicut ipsum Verbum perfecte et adaequate cognosci non potest, nisi divinitas Patris cognoscatur, ita . . . nec ipse Christus perfecte et complete cognosci potest nisi cognita Matre."

¹⁴⁵ *Musters, op. cit.*, p. 88.

¹⁴⁶ *Discursus*, vol. 2, disc. 214, p. 18, n. 2: "Quod quidem dominum in duobus fundatum esse docent Theologi. Primo, in conjunctione et affinitate quadam inter Deum et Virginem. Secundo, in singulari quadam ad nostram redemptionem cooperatione. Sicut enim Christus eo quod nos redemit speciali titulo Dominus est et Rex noster: ita B. Virgo propter singularem modum quo ad nostram redemptionem concurrit, et substantiam corporis sui Christo ministrando, et illum voluntarie pro nobis offerendo, nostramque salutem desiderando, petendo et procurando."

¹⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, vol. 2, disc. 371, pp. 458-60.

over to His Mother to be Queen of His Kingdom, as the highest honor He can give to one so worthy.¹⁴⁸

Without doubt the most elaborate single treatise on the queenship of Mary during this age is that of the Spanish Augustinian, *Bartholomew de los Rios* (d. 1652), whose *De Hierarchia Mariana* was written *ex professo* to set forth the theological foundation for Mary's royal dignity.¹⁴⁹ Thanks to Father Musters' excellent book on *The Sovereignty of Mary in the Mariological Writings of Bartholomew de los Rios*,^{149a} we can give this author the place he deserves in the development of Mariology during this period, and especially on the question of Mary's queenship. We can do no more than outline his discussion here; yet it is worth a considerable treatment because it is at once a representative presentation of the thought and development of the age, and an excellent summary of what had been written previous to it. The *fact* of the sovereignty of Mary he proves with scholastic rigor in the first part of the book, presenting extensive evidence from Scripture, the Fathers, and the theologians, citing many of the writers mentioned in the course of this paper.¹⁵⁰ In discussing the theological basis of Mary's queenship, he finds a threefold foundation for it. First, in the Immaculate Conception and the fullness of grace that was Mary's. It was by grace that Mary was made the greatest of all creatures, placed at the summit of the hierarchy of order and dignity—and through this grace given to her she merits the dominion, the dignity and the title of

¹⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 459-60: "Etenim nullus alius in terris fuit, qui tanto dominio dignus esset, excepta sola B.V., quam, quia Christus summe honoravit ut Matrem, ideo etiam hoc dominium ultro et liberaliter ei communicavit."

¹⁴⁹ *De Hierarchia Mariana libri sex, in quibus imperium, virtus, et nomen B^{nae} Virg. Mariae declaratur, et Mancipiorum eius dignitas ostenditur*: Auctore R.P.M. Fr. Bartholomaeo de los Rios y Alarcón. . . . Antverpiae, ex officina Plantiniana Balthasaris Moreti, 1641.

^{149a} Musters, A., *La souveraineté de la Vierge d'après les écrits mariologiques de Barthélemy de los Rios*, Bruges, 1946.

¹⁵⁰ *De Hierarchia*, lib. 1; cf. Musters, *op. cit.*, pp. 92-98.

Queen.¹⁵¹ The second foundation of Mary's queenship is the divine Maternity. This gives her two titles to queenship. First, through the divine Maternity Mary was given a marvelous transcendence over all creatures. It gives to her the closest possible relation to God, bringing her an excellence and grandeur beyond description, as it were an infinite dignity because her Son was infinite, a dignity by which she surpasses all creatures, and therefore by right of it merits to be Queen of all.¹⁵²

Her maternity is further a source of her queenship because through it she is made the heiress of the kingdom of her Son. In establishing this, Father de los Rios follows the arguments outlined by Salazar and de Vega¹⁵³ showing how the honor of the kingdom, inasmuch as it comes by natural right to Christ, redounds to His Immaculate Mother, who thus becomes by her maternity the co-heir with Christ and Queen of all of which He is King; since He has this kingdom by nature and by conquest, Mary shares it by both titles and is truly Queen.¹⁵⁴ She is the Queen-Mother in the full, formal sense of the term.

The third foundation of Mary's queenship is her role as Co-redemptrix. By sharing with Christ in His passion and death, Mary has merited to share with Him the kingdom. She has replaced Eve as the head of the human race because she with Christ has restored all things, regained what Eve lost, through her co-operation in the redemption, her voluntary offering of

¹⁵¹ *De Hier.*, pp. 91 ff., pp. 547-550; cf. Musters, *op. cit.*, pp. 103-116.

¹⁵² *De Hier.*, pp. 23 ff., 522-24. Musters, *op. cit.*, 116-130.

¹⁵³ Cf. above, footnotes 129, 138, 139.

¹⁵⁴ *De Hier.*, pp. 20-23: "Unde necessario sequitur imperium et regnum filio naturale vel armis acquisitum, parentibus eo ipso quod filii est communicari. . . . Concludimus ergo B. Mariam Virginem proprio ac in omni verborum ac juris rigore Dominam esse totius universi: quia Mater est Regis summi, regnum istud non electione, sed jure naturali consecuti: ipse enim in hoc natus est, Maria in hoc peperit; nec magis mirum hanc pariendo quam illum nascendo tantum acquirere dominium." Cf. Musters, *op. cit.*, pp. 130-8.

her Son, and her compassion. Thus it is fitting that those liberated by Christ and His Mother from the tyranny of sin and the devil, and admitted to their sweet reign of mercy, should faithfully serve this King and this Queen.¹⁵⁵

Father de los Rios has some very interesting reflections on the nature of the sovereignty of Mary.¹⁵⁶ He insists that her preeminence is not purely honorary, but includes a real dominion over her subjects. With St. Thomas and Aristotle¹⁵⁷ he divides the various types of dominion: first, there is the rule, or *regnum*, which includes the surveillance over the common good of the subjects, begetting the obligation of the sovereign to foster that good for his subjects. To this dominion correspond the titles of King and Queen, and it includes a civil and political rule. The second type of dominion includes the right over subjects to use them in a more absolute sense, even for the good of the one who rules—this is the *dominium utile*, that is, the right to use a person or thing to one's own personal pleasure or advantage and to this correspond the titles *Dominus* or *Domina*, i.e., one having true dominion over subjects. Finally, there is the dominion that is absolute—the *dominium herile sive despoticum*—the dominion of an absolute master over slaves and servants—and to this correspond the titles of Master and Mistress.¹⁵⁸ The sovereignty of Mary includes all three types of dominion: she is the sovereign Lady, or *Domina*, because of her direct dominion over all things; the Mistress, or *Hera*, because of her power over her servants and slaves; and Queen because of her civil and political rule.¹⁵⁹ So Mary's dominion and sovereignty is far beyond that of any

¹⁵⁵ *De Hier.*, pp. 54-73; cf. Musters, *op. cit.*, pp. 138-159.

¹⁵⁶ *De Hier.*, pp. 16 ff. Cf. Musters, *op. cit.*, pp. 99-103; 161-174.

¹⁵⁷ Musters, *op. cit.*, p. 163.

¹⁵⁸ *De Hier.*, pp. 16, 108.

¹⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 18: "Dominam dicit, ob directum rerum omnium dominium; Heram, ob potestatem in servos ac mancipia. . . . Reginam dicit ob politicum et civile imperium."

Our Lady's Queenship in the Middle Ages

167

earthly ruler.¹⁶⁰ It is, indeed, the greatest that could possibly be communicated to a creature by God.¹⁶¹ And this dominion she exercises everywhere—in heaven, on earth, in purgatory, and even in hell over the damned there. Father Musters concludes that “for de los Rios, the *mancipatus marianus*, or, as it was called later by Bl. Grignon de Montfort, the *esclavage marial*, is but a logical corollary of his doctrine on the sovereignty of Mary.”¹⁶²

Thus, Father Musters points out, Bartholomew de los Rios made two great contributions to the question of the sovereignty of Mary. He gave it a solid ontological or metaphysical basis, founded on her supreme grace and the divine Maternity. And secondly, he gave great precision and logical clarity to the nature of her absolute dominion over all creation, second only to that of God Himself, as absolute as could be given to a creature.¹⁶³ Under these developments, the sovereignty of Mary appears, then, not as an *aspect* of Mary's Co-redemption and universal mediation, but a special prerogative in itself that is a function parallel to that of Christ the King.¹⁶⁴

¹⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 16, 17: “Notum est . . . Regem propter regnum, non regnum propter regem esse: unde illa nascitur in Regibus obligatio, quod teneantur ex officio pro sustentatione, honore, observantia et tributis quae a subditis accipiunt, vicissim curam et sollicitudinem circa commune bonum ipsis impendere; neque subditi servi aut mancipia Regum sunt, sed potius ipsi coguntur subditorum commoditatibus deservire. . . . Contra vero in regno Dominae ac Reginae nostrae non ipsa propter nos, sed nos propter illam facti sumus; non illa Regina facta, ut nos commode regeremur sed nos subditi illius creati, ut ipsa gloriose imperaret.”

¹⁶¹ *Ibid.*, p. 113: “Cum probatum sit, supremam esse domini rationem quae potest a Deo merae creaturae communicari, eam quam in Virgine Deipara veneremur.” Cf. Musters, *op. cit.*, pp. 167-172.

¹⁶² Musters, *op. cit.*, p. 173. “Aussi pour De los Rios, le *mancipatus marianus*, ou comme l'a appelé plus tard le Bx. Grignon de Montfort l'“esclavage marial,” n'est que le corollaire logique de sa doctrine sur la souveraineté de Marie.” In 1626, De los Rios wrote a brief tract on *El Esclavo de Maria*. Cf. Musters, p. 30.

¹⁶³ Musters, *op. cit.*, pp. 176-77.

¹⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 177-78.

With the writings of Bartholomew de los Rios we bring this paper to a close. Not that the theology of the queenship of Mary ends there—far from it. With de los Rios, the full flowering is only just beginning! But he does represent to a certain extent the summit of the tendencies towards which the speculations on subject can go. There were many others who carried this development onwards, and examined further the problems opened by Salazar, Justin of Miechow and Bartholomew de los Rios. For example, in the 17th century, men like Ripalda in Spain and Novati in Italy; in France the eminent “French school” of ascetical theologians and spiritual writers centered around de Berulle, de Condren, Olier and St. John Eudes; in the 18th century, men like Seldmayr and Seeauer and Peralta, not to mention St. Alphonus Liguori and St. Louis M. Grignon de Montfort, whose Marian works are too well known to need reproduction here—all these men gloriously furthered the cause of Our Lady, Queen. They could be a separate study in themselves. They develop the theology considerably, but fundamentally they treat of the same phases and aspects of the doctrine as did Bartholomew de los Rios.

But even in passing these men over lightly with only a mention, the original purpose of this paper has been fulfilled, that is, to show the constancy of the *fact* of our Lady's queenship in the theological tradition of these centuries, and to give some elements at least of the development of that doctrine. We have seen the simple mention of the fact in the writers of the early period unfold into these elaborate treatises of the 17th century, in which the fundamental questions of the nature of Máry's queenly power, its extent, and some appreciation of its connotations and corollaries were brought clearly into the light—all to the greater honor and glory of our Heavenly Queen, and to a greater understanding on our part of the place she holds in governing, by the side of her divine Son, the

Our Lady's Queenship in the Middle Ages

169

universe and all the loyal subjects of their kingdom in it. Her glorious privileges as Queen are the crowning achievement, the final reward for her to whom all things were given when it was given to her to be the Mother of God.

REV. DR. WILLIAM F. HILL, S.S.,
St. Mary's Seminary,
Baltimore, Maryland.